

05-13-21 Advisory Committee Meeting

West Linn Housing Advisory Committee HB2001 Meeting #3

ATTENDEES

Advisory Committee

Vicki Olson

Jim Farrell

Karie Oakes

Darren Gusdorf

Roseann Johnson HBA

Joe Vennes (HACC)

Richard Nowacki

Project Team Members

Darren Wyss-City of West Linn

Robert Mansolillo - DLCD

Sou Garner-MIG

Alex Dupey-MIG

AGENDA

- Welcome
- Schedule and Progress Update
- Outreach Summary: Results
- Code Amendments
 - Revisions/Changes
 - Considerations
 - Questions/Concerns
- Next Steps / Close

SUMMARY

The meeting began with a welcome and introductions led by MIG's Project Manager. MIG presented the draft code changes, as well as posing a series of questions for the committee to consider.

SCHEDULE

The project concludes in June with draft amendments with the Advisory Committee's comments incorporated from the meeting. The city communicated that this is the first phase of two phases to address the requirements of House Bill 2001. Following the submittal of the final draft code amendments, the city will solicit a consultant for outreach and engagement.

OUTREACH SUMMARY

A survey asking the community their thoughts, concerns and ideas about the HB2001 middle housing requirements was open from April 1 to April 18. The summary slides of key findings can be found in the

presentation. The majority of the questions centered on specific elements that the community would like the city to consider in a second phase of the project that primarily looks at the implementing the requirements of HB2001 for middle housing in West Linn. A total of 669 responds were received. 91% of the respondents stated they live in West Linn and 48% of total respondents were somewhat familiar with the zoning regulations.

Generally, West Linn residents want to see multiple housing choices to meet their housing needs at different parts of their lives. However, residents do not want what they perceive as impacts of that housing within the neighborhood whether its more parking, design, or size and density.

CODE AMENDMENTS

The packet that was presented to the advisory committee are the minimum necessary to comply with HB2001. Major highlights of the code amendments included:

Definitions: the Middle Housing types were defined using the language from the state requirements.

Residential Base Zones: Middle housing types have been added to the permitted and conditional uses. The siting development standards for middle housing as required by state law were also updated. Additionally, the amendments followed the existing allowances for the base zone and extended those allowances to the middle housing type. If there was a conflict between state requirements and local codes, the state requirements would supersede. This was generally not the case.

Commercial Base Zones: Although not required from HB2001, the Neighborhood Commercial (NC), General Commercial (GC) and the Office Business Center (OBC) zoning districts allow for single-family homes and were updated for consistency.

Parking: Standards updated to reflect the required minimums to the OARs and allowances

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

Should the City allow attached AND detached Duplexes, Triplexes and Quadplexes for more flexibility? Or the minimalist approach of only attached units?

Feedback from the group centered mainly around the design of attached or detached middle housing types. This would be considered and then addressed during the second implementation phase of the middle housing project.

How should we address street improvements for middle housing?

Currently, half street improvements, typically curb, gutter and sidewalk, are required for development of any housing development project, this includes Accessory Dwelling Units. This, generally, would increase the development costs of the projects and could deter their development. Should the city continue with this practice for middle housing types, knowing that there could be an impact to development of middle housing types.

An advisory committee member stated that there exists an inverse relationship between affordability and the requirement of half street improvements. If the cost of housing development increases, the affordability of the unit will decrease. This should be considered in future policy discussions.

Within the HB2001 requirements, jurisdictions could waive or lessen requirements for single-family developments or apply them to middle housing as they would be to single family. However, the requirements cannot be more restrictive for middle housing than they are for single family housing development.

Another advisory committee member suggested considering a location-specific approach for half-street improvements, where the City would exempt half street improvements depending on where the development is occurring – whether it is an infill or new build in the outskirts of the City. This would be similar to the exemptions allowed for undergrounding utilities for smaller infill developments.

Should the City allow Cottage Clusters on individual lots or parcels that have a smaller minimum lot size?

HB2001 allows cities to decide for themselves if they would allow cottage clusters to be subdivided into smaller lots or have the cottage cluster on a single lot.

The advisory committee supported allowing cottage clusters to be subdivided to encourage pride of ownership. However, it was also stated that the size of lots should be defined. The advisory committee also suggested considering the difficulty in administering of a 5 or more-condominium map due to Oregon construction defect laws.

Should the City consider more flexible standards for middle housing types (increased lot coverage/FAR plus the setbacks/height mention below)

Should the City incentivize middle housing? Based on the menu of strategies to increase housing production presented with the HB2003 work, this can include:

- *Zoning Incentives for Affordable and Workforce Housing:*
 - *Incentives that center on providing a community benefit (affordable housing, land dedication for trails or parks, etc.)*
 - *System Development Charge Exemptions or Deferrals*
 - *Expedited Development Review*
 - *Reduce setback if more landscaping is provided?*
 - *Increase height if the second story is recessed back?*

The initial feedback from the advisory committee is in support of flexible standards and incentivizing developments to ensure affordability, sustainability and to increase the diversity in housing options available.

Should the City consider expedited review for townhome/cottage cluster property divisions?

The advisory committee expressed support of an expedited review process for cost savings to the applicant. However, the process should be clearly outlined, and the design and siting standards should be clear and objective. An advisory committee member stated that their communities would be favorable to an expediated review. There was concern that for an expedited review, the decision maker would be a person who does not have local knowledge of the community. Additionally, consideration should be given to how the cost savings at the application review phase can be passed on to the buyer to support housing affordability.

Do you agree with the current recommendation of implementing the “blanket coverage” approach to allow all middle housing types on all lots that permit single-family detached residential?

- *This can be viewed as the equity option as all neighborhoods can contribute to meeting the demand for middle housing into the future.*

Due to time constraints, this question was not discussed however, it will be discussed during the next phase in the process.

Next Steps

Staff and MIG will still be taking comments or questions to be incorporated into the final draft amendments package.

The City will be kicking off a Phase 2, or Policy and Implementation Phase, in the coming months. This will include meetings with neighborhood association, multiple planning commission meetings, the historic review board, and meeting other civic organizations to get the message out. This will also include discussion around the bigger policy questions, such as discussed at this meeting.

The City anticipates bringing a final code amendment package to the Planning Commission and City Council beginning in February 2022.